



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,524	08/09/2001	Kiyotaka Matsumoto	500.40472X00	4083

24956 7590 07/18/2006

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.  
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD  
SUITE 370  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, TRI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,524

Applicant(s)

MATSUMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Tri V. Nguyen

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. In the amendment file on April 26, 2006, Claims 1, 2 and 5-7 have been amended, Claims 8-12 have been cancelled and Claims 13-24 have been added. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-7 and 13-24.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 21-24 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 21-24 are dependent claims of claim 19 which is a claim directed to a "system"; however, Claims 21-24 is directed to a "method" claim. For examination purposes, the Examiner has interpreted Claims 21-24 as being dependent on the "system" claim 19. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 7, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. and applied to the "The Boston Globe" website ([www.boston.com/globe](http://www.boston.com/globe), hereon referred to as boston.com). Furthermore, the program suite has been described by the published articles of Editor & Publisher (hereon referred to as Editor & Publisher), The Seybold Report Vol. 26, No. 22 (hereon referred to as Seybold 26-22), The Seybold Report Vol. 23, No. 22 (hereon referred to as Seybold 23-22),

Art Unit: 1751

Business Wire (hereon referred to as Business Wire) and Peter Dyson and Rosanne Rossello (hereon referred to as Dyson).

Regarding Claim 1, Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson disclose an advertisement contents providing method of displaying, on an information processing apparatus connected to a network, advertisement contents registration of which has been requested from a facsimile apparatus, comprising:

- a. receiving facsimile registration information from said facsimile apparatus of an advertiser, said facsimile registration information indicating a registrant ID, a category ID, and said advertisement contents, and storing image data of said advertisement contents into advertiser-dedicated page data corresponding to said registrant ID and said category ID described in said facsimile registration information wherein the advertiser-dedicated page data is in an advertisement service/management processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);
- b. reading, from an advertiser information database a facsimile number of the advertiser corresponding to the registrant ID (Dyson: page 2, § 3 and Seybold 23-22, page 14, parag. 3);
- c. acknowledging receipt of the advertisement contents by accessing the facsimile apparatus using the facsimile number read from the advertiser information database (Dyson: page 2, § 3);
- d. sending a request for said advertisement contents from a subscriber-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said advertisement contents being stored in said advertiser-dedicated page data in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus (Boston.com: pages 4 [see "Classifieds" section], 12-17 and page 19),
- e. reading said advertisement contents from said advertiser-dedicated page data in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said advertisement contents being requested by said subscriber-side processing apparatus, and sending said advertisement contents to said subscriber-side

Art Unit: 1751

processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 4 [see the advertisement banner] and page 19 [the "Classified" section]), and

- f. receiving said advertisement contents sent from said advertisement service/management processing apparatus and outputting said advertisement contents to an output device of said subscriber-side processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 4 [see the advertisement banner] and page 19 [the "Classified" section]).

Regarding Claim 2, Boston.com and Editor & Publisher disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the step of acknowledging receipt includes sending back said facsimile registration information to said facsimile apparatus of said advertiser identified by said registrant ID in said facsimile registration information when said facsimile registration information is received (Boston.com: page 8, § 2 and Editor & Publisher: page 1, § 6).

Claim 7 describes a system of the method of Claim 1; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 7.

Regarding claim 13, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson disclose an advertisement contents providing method of displaying, on an information processing apparatus connected to a network, advertisement contents registration of which has been requested from a facsimile apparatus, comprising:

- a. receiving facsimile registration information from the facsimile apparatus of an advertiser, the facsimile registration information indicating a registrant ID, a category ID, and the advertisement contents (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

- b. storing image data of the advertisement contents into advertiser-dedicated page data corresponding to the registrant ID and the category ID described in the facsimile registration information, wherein the advertiser-dedicated page data is in an advertisement service/management processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);
- c. reading, from an advertiser information database, a facsimile number of the advertiser corresponding to the registrant ID (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);
- d. using the facsimile number read from the advertiser information database to access the facsimile apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);
- e. sending back registration information to the facsimile apparatus of the advertiser (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);
- f. sending a request for the advertisement contents from a subscriber-side processing apparatus to the advertisement service/management processing apparatus, wherein the advertisement contents are stored in the advertiser dedicated page data in the advertisement service/management processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);
- g. reading the advertisement contents from the advertiser-dedicated page data in the advertisement service/management processing apparatus, the advertisement contents being requested from the subscriber-side processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

Art Unit: 1751

- h. sending the advertisement contents to the subscriber-side processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2); and
- i. receiving the advertisement contents sent from the advertisement service/management processing apparatus and outputting the advertisement contents to an output device of the subscriber-side processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2).

Claim 19 describes a system of the method of Claim 13; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 13.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 4, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the program suite of “Adfax” and “Adcapture” of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the “The Boston Globe” website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson in view of Greenberg (WO 00/39657).

Regarding Claim 3, Boston.com discloses the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 1 (Boston.com: pages 4, 12-17 and 19), but does not explicitly teach that wherein characters in said image data of said advertisement contents are recognized so as to generate advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of

character data, and when said subscriber-side processing apparatus that has sent said sending request for said advertisement contents is a portable-type information processing apparatus, said generated advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of said character data is sent to said subscriber-side processing apparatus which is said request source. In an analogous art, Greenberg discloses a method wherein the advertisement is composed, stored in a database, sent to a portable device (cell phone) of a subscriber and displayed on the portable device (page 3, lines 3-18; page 6, lines 3-21 and page 7, lines 3-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Boston.com with sending the advertisement to a portable device as taught by Greenberg since it was known in the art that distributing the advertisement to portable device will enhance the effectiveness of the advertisement as the user has more flexibility in accessing the advertisement.

Regarding Claim 4, Boston.com discloses the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 2 (Boston.com: pages 4, 12-17 and 19), but does not explicitly teach that wherein characters in said image data of said advertisement contents are recognized so as to generate advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of character data, and when said subscriber-side processing apparatus that has sent said sending request for said advertisement contents is a portable-type information processing apparatus, said generated advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of said character data is sent to said subscriber-side processing apparatus which is said request source. In an analogous art, Greenberg discloses a method wherein the advertisement is composed, stored in a database, sent to a portable device (cell phone) of a subscriber and displayed on the portable device (page 3, lines 3-18; page 6, lines 3-21 and page 7, lines 3-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Boston.com with sending the advertisement to a portable device as taught by Greenberg since it was known in the art that distributing the advertisement to portable device will enhance the effectiveness of the advertisement as the user has more flexibility in accessing the advertisement.



Art Unit: 1751

Regarding Claim 14, Boston.com discloses the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 13 (Boston.com: pages 4, 12-17 and 19), but does not explicitly teach that wherein characters in the image data of the advertisement contents are recognized so as to generate advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of character data, and when the subscriber-side processing apparatus that has sent the sending request for the advertisement contents is a portable-type information processing apparatus, the generated advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of the character data is sent to the subscriber-side processing apparatus which is the request source. In an analogous art, Greenberg discloses a method wherein the advertisement is composed, stored in a database, sent to a portable device (cell phone) of a subscriber and displayed on the portable device (page 3, lines 3-18; page 6, lines 3-21 and page 7, lines 3-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Boston.com with sending the advertisement to a portable device as taught by Greenberg since it was known in the art that distributing the advertisement to portable device will enhance the effectiveness of the advertisement as the user has more flexibility in accessing the advertisement.

Claim 20 describes a system of the method of Claim 14; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 20.

7. Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson.

Regarding Claims 5 and 15, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. and applied to the "The Boston Globe" website Boston.com disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claims 1 and 13, but do not explicitly teach further comprising:

a) sending an inquiry about collection target information from a sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collection target information indicating an advertiser as a collection target of an advertisement usage fee,

b) receiving said inquiry from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and making reference to advertiser information indicating information on advertisers that have made said contract to perform advertisement publication on said advertiser-dedicated page in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and reading, of said advertisers indicated by said advertiser information, information on an advertiser that is in charge of a sales-office that has made said inquiry, and sending, to said sales-office-side processing apparatus, said read information on said advertiser as said collection target information indicating said advertiser to which said sales-office will perform said collection of said advertisement usage fee,

c) receiving said collection target information from said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and outputting said collection target information to an output device of said sales-office-side processing apparatus,

d) sending collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collected information indicating said advertiser to which said collection of said advertisement usage fee has been performed, and

e) receiving said collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and outputting said collected information to an output device of said advertisement service/management processing apparatus.

The Examiner notes that the steps of Claims 5 and 15 pertain to standard accounting practices to collect a fee from an advertiser for a displaying an advertisement. Boston.com and Editor & Publisher discloses collecting a fee depending on the attributes (length, type, category and frequency) of the advertisement (Boston.com: pages 12-17 and 20-22) by a sales personnel and program (Boston.com: page 23 and Editor & Publisher: page 1, § 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught Boston.com and Editor & Publisher to establish a sales office in communication with a service/management to collect a usage fee for placing an

Art Unit: 1751

advertisement. One would have been motivated to modify the method to better track the advertisement transactions.

Regarding Claim 6, Boston.com and Editor & Publisher disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 2, but do not explicitly teach further comprising:

- a) sending an inquiry about collection target information from a sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collection target information indicating an advertiser as a collection target of an advertisement usage fee,
- b) receiving said inquiry from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and making reference to advertiser information indicating information on advertisers that have made said contract to perform said advertisement publication on said advertiser-dedicated page in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and reading, of said advertisers indicated by said advertiser information, information on an advertiser that is in charge of a sales-office that has made said inquiry, and sending, to said sales-office-side processing apparatus, said read information on said advertiser as said collection target information indicating said advertiser to which said sales-office will perform said collection of said advertisement usage fee,
- c) receiving said collection target information from said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and outputting said collection target information to an output device of said sales-office-side processing apparatus,
- d) sending collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collected information indicating said advertiser to which said collection of said advertisement usage fee has been performed, and
- e) receiving said collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and outputting said collected information to an output device of said advertisement service/management processing apparatus.

The Examiner notes that the steps of Claim 6 pertain to standard accounting practices to collect a fee from an advertiser for displaying an advertisement. Boston.com and Editor & Publisher discloses collecting a fee depending on the attributes (length, type, category and frequency) of the advertisement (Boston.com: pages 12-17

Art Unit: 1751

and 20-22) by a sales personnel and program (Boston.com: page 23 and Editor & Publisher: page 1, § 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught Boston.com and Editor & Publisher to establish a sales office in communication with a service/management to collect a usage fee for placing an advertisement. One would have been motivated to modify the method to better track the advertisement transactions.

Regarding claim 16, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 13, further comprising:

- a. determining whether the registrant ID matches a registrant ID in the advertiser information database (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2), but do not explicitly disclose
- b. wherein if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser information database, the step of sending back the facsimile registration information to the facsimile apparatus of the advertiser is performed.

Seybold 23-22 discloses the feature of time stamp check for fax documents in a database (page 15, parag. 1-3). Furthermore, Dyson discloses the feature of an identifier in the process of sending a fax confirmation (page 2, parag 2-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method to include sending back a fax if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser information database. One would have been motivated to modify the method to better track the advertisement transactions and to ensure that the transaction is entered in the accounting division.

Regarding claim 18, the program suite discloses the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 13, further comprising:

Art Unit: 1751

- a. extracting the image data of the advertisement contents and generating a Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) file for displaying the image data (Editor & Publisher: page 1, parag. 6 and Boston.com ; and
- b. extracting character data from the image data and generating an HTML file for displaying the character data.

Editor & Publisher discloses the feature of scanning the images and converting the faxes to computer text (page 1, parag. 6). Furthermore, Boston.com discloses the feature of displaying the advertisement on the web (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method to include the step of converting to HTML. One would have been motivated to modify the method to facilitate and expedite the publications onto the Internet.

Claims 21, 22 and 24 describe a system of the method of Claims 15, 16 and 18 respectively; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claims 21, 22 and 24.

8. Claims 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson in view of Hymel (US 6,246,336).

Regarding claim 17, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire, Dyson and Hymel disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 16, but do not explicitly disclose wherein if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser information database, the step of sending back the facsimile registration information to the facsimile apparatus of the advertiser is not performed and the facsimile registration information is discarded.

Art Unit: 1751

Seybold 23-22 discloses the feature of time stamp check for fax documents in a database (page 15, parag. 1-3). Furthermore, Dyson discloses the feature of an identifier in the process of sending a fax confirmation (page 2, parag 2-6). In an analogous art, Hymel disclose the feature of disregarding an advertisement when errors are found (col 4, lines 18-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method to include disregarding the advertisement submission if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser information database. One would have been motivated to modify the method to ensure that the transaction is entered in the accounting division since the advertiser cannot be properly identified.

Claim 23 describes a system of the method of Claim 17; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire, Dyson and Hymel as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 23.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed on April 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner's ground of rejection under 102(b) is defective (page 21), the Examiner respectfully indicates that the ground of rejection is a program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. and applied to the "The Boston Globe" website and that the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson are used to describe features of the program suite. Therefore, the ground of rejection under 102(b) is proper.
- b. In response to Applicant's argument regarding Claims 1 and 7 that the program suite of "Adfax" and "AdCapture" does not teach or suggest  
"receiving facsimile registration information from said facsimile apparatus of

an advertiser, said facsimile registration information indicating a registrant ID, a category ID, and said advertisement contents, and storing image data of said advertisement contents into advertiser-dedicated page data corresponding to said registrant ID and said category ID described in said facsimile registration information, wherein the advertiser dedicated page data is in an advertisement service/management processing apparatus" or "reading from an advertiser information database, a facsimile number of the advertiser corresponding to the registrant ID" or "acknowledging receipt of the advertisement contents by accessing the facsimile apparatus using the facsimile number read from the advertiser information database" (page 28) and regarding claim 2 "wherein the step of acknowledging receipt includes sending back said facsimile registration information to said facsimile apparatus of said advertiser identified by said registrant ID in said facsimile registration information when said facsimile registration information is received" (page 29), the Examiner respectfully notes that Dyson discloses the features of an identifier related to the advertisement and a confirmation fax being sent to the advertiser via the phone number on the advertiser's fax (page 2, parag. 1-6); Seybold 23-22 and 26-22 disclose the features of a classification and an advertisement/advertiser database from which ads can be extracted and messages can be sent to advertisers (Seybold 23-22: page 14, parag. 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, parag. 2); and boston.com discloses the features of a categorization and fax confirmation (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17).

Art Unit: 1751

- c. In response to Applicant's argument regarding Claims 3-6 on the basis of Claims 3-6 being dependent on Claim 1, the Examiner directs the Applicant to the rejection of Claim 1 and the response to the arguments above.

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri V. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6965. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

nvt



ERIC W. STAMBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600